

**Federal Agency Name:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of the Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, National Center for Environmental Economics

**Announcement Title:** Environmental Economics Workshops, and Data Gathering for Dissertation and Early Career Research on the Pollution Control Aspects of Environmental Economics

**Action:** Request for Proposals (RFP)

**Announcement Type:** Initial Request for Proposals (RFP)

**Funding Opportunity Number:** EPA-OPEI-NCEE-10-01

**Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA):** 66.611 Environmental Policy and Innovation Grants

**Due Date:** Proposals must be received by the Agency by **11:59 PM Eastern Standard Time (EST), Monday, April 26, 2010**. Electronic submission using Grants.gov is encouraged; see Section IV for instructions on submitting your proposals using Grants.gov as well as alternative submission methods, if necessary. Questions about this Request for Proposal must be submitted in writing via e-mail and must be received by the Agency Contact, Shelley Levitt (see [Section VII](#)), before **Monday, April 19, 2010**. Written responses will be posted on EPA's website at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/eed.nsf/Webpages/GrantsFAQ.html>

*Following EPA's evaluation of proposals, all applicants will be notified regarding their status.*

## OVERVIEW

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Center for Environmental Economics (NCEE) is soliciting proposals for Federal assistance for (1) sponsoring "Environmental Economics Workshops," and for (2) research support for "Data Gathering for Dissertation and Early Career Research on the Pollution Control Aspects of Environmental Economics."

Assistance under this announcement is generally available to States and local governments, territories and possessions, Indian Tribes, interstate organizations, intrastate organizations, and possessions of the U.S., including the District of Columbia, public and private universities and colleges, hospitals, laboratories, other public or private nonprofit institutions, and individuals. Nonprofit organizations described in Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that engage in lobbying activities as defined in Section 3 of the Lobbying

Disclosure Act of 1995 are not eligible to apply. For profit organizations are not eligible to apply for funding under this RFP.

The total amount anticipated to be awarded under this RFP is approximately \$400,000. All of these funds may not be fully obligated by EPA at the time of awards, but may be paid out by EPA in installments over several years at \$100,000-\$150,000 per year, depending on the availability of EPA funds, satisfactory performance of applicants, other applicable considerations, and the cash flow requirements of awarded proposals. Total requests for EPA funding in proposals submitted for Area 1 must be for more than \$25,000 and less than \$150,000, and total requests for EPA funding in proposals submitted for Area 2 must be for more than \$30,000 and less than \$75,000 to be considered. EPA may award assistance agreements for project periods of up to 5 years where appropriate. While proposals must address one Area only, eligible applicants may submit more than one proposal for each Area, or proposals for both Areas, so long as each proposal is separately submitted and demonstrably different. Individual assistance agreements may be fully or incrementally funded. Cost sharing is not required. EPA anticipates awarding 5 to 7 assistance agreements under this announcement as either grants or cooperative agreements depending on the extent of Agency involvement in the funded project.

A complete copy of this announcement, including discussion of proposal materials and requirements, is posted at:

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/eed.nsf/Webpages/GrantSolicitations.html>.

## **Contents by Section**

- I. [Funding Opportunity Description](#)
  - A. [Introduction](#)
  - B. [Background](#)
  - C. [Authority and Regulations](#)
  - D. [Specific Areas of Interest/Objectives and Outcomes](#)
    - 1. [Environmental Economics Workshops](#)
    - 2. [Data Gathering for Dissertation and Early Career Research on the Pollution Control Aspects of Environmental Economics](#)
  - E. [References](#)
  - F. [Special Requirements](#)
- II. [Award Information](#)
- III. [Eligibility Information](#)
  - A. [Eligible Applicants](#)
  - B. [Cost Sharing or Match](#)
  - C. [Other Threshold Eligibility Criteria](#)
- IV. [Proposal and Submission Information](#)
  - A. [Internet Address to Request Proposal](#)
  - B. [Content and Form of Proposal Submission](#)
    - 1. [Standard Form SF424 – Application for Federal Assistance](#)

- 2. [Key Contacts.](#)
- 3. [Budget SF-424A](#)
- 4. [Narrative Proposal](#)
- 5. [Resumes](#)
- 6. [Guidelines Limitations and Additional Requirements](#)
- C. [Submission Dates and Times](#)
- D. [Funding Restrictions](#)
- E. [Grants.gov Proposal Submission Instructions](#)
  - 1. [Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions](#)
- F. [Intergovernmental Review](#)
- G. [Pre-proposal/Proposal Assistance and Communications](#)
- H. [Contracts and Subawards](#)
- V. [Proposal Review Information](#)
  - A. [Evaluation Criteria for Area 1](#) (Environmental Economics Workshops)
  - B. [Evaluation Criteria for Area 2](#) (Dissertation and Early Career Research)
  - C. [Other Evaluation Factors](#)
  - D. [Selection Process](#)
- VI. [Award Administration Information](#)
  - A. [Award Notices](#)
  - B. [Administrative and National Policy Requirements](#)
  - C. [Reporting](#)
  - D. [Disputes](#)
  - E. [Nonprofit Administrative Capability Clause](#)
  - F. [Human Subjects](#)
  - G. [Public Access and Information Release](#)
- VII. [Agency Contacts](#)
- VIII. [Other Information](#)

## **Section I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION**

### **A. Introduction**

The EPA's National Center for Environmental Economics (NCEE) supports leading-edge research to stimulate the sound use of economics that fulfills EPA's mission to protect human health and safeguard the natural environment. NCEE and its predecessors have long sponsored research to improve the data and methods available to determine the economic value of improved pollution control and other aspects of environmental economics. Much of the resulting research can be found on the NCEE Website at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/eed.nsf/webpages/EnvironmentalEconomicsReports.html>.

This RFP addresses two Areas of environmental economics training and research (See Section D below). Proposals must address one of these Areas. While proposals must address one Area only, eligible applicants may submit more than one proposal for each Area, or proposals for both Areas, so long as each proposal is separately submitted and demonstrably different.

**(Area 1) Environmental Economics Workshops** in the following categories:

- **Dissertation Workshops** – the goal of these workshops is to attract the best and brightest graduate students/new PhDs to improve the quality of current research topics in environmental economics.
- **Methods Development and Training Workshops** – these workshops should provide guidance and training on a specific analytical activity of importance in environmental economics.
- **Current Issues Workshops** – these workshops should advance the field of environmental economics by exploring current and emerging issues of national or regional significance.

**(Area 2) Data Gathering for Dissertation and Early Career Research on the Pollution Control Aspects of Environmental Economics.** NCEE has long believed that there is a serious shortage of empirical data to determine the economic benefits, costs and impacts of measures taken to control pollutants. Although there are substantial academic incentives to write theoretical dissertations and other papers, it is often difficult for graduate students and investigators early in their career to find financial support for empirically-based work in this Area. NCEE believes that the provision of such financial support may remedy some of this imbalance.

## **B. Background**

The agreements resulting from this RFP are expected to support the Enabling Support Program objective and Regulatory/Economic Management and Analysis program project within the EPA's strategic planning architecture. The EPA's 2006 Strategic Plan may be found at [http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/2006/entire\\_report.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/2006/entire_report.pdf) (PDF) (184 pp, 11.56 MB), and proposed changes to the plan prepared in 2009 may be found at [http://epa.gov/ocfo/plan/pdfs/strategic\\_plan\\_change\\_document\\_9-30-08.pdf](http://epa.gov/ocfo/plan/pdfs/strategic_plan_change_document_9-30-08.pdf) (65 pp, 904KB). These projects will also support one or more of the efforts undertaken under Goal 1 (Clean Air and Global Climate Change), Goal 2 (Clean and Safe Water), Goal 3 (Land Preservation and Restoration) and Goal 4 (Healthy Communities and Ecosystems) with reference to the Enhance Science and Research objectives for each (1.6, 2.3, 3.3 and 4.4, respectively). The overall goal of the projects is to elevate the state of knowledge of practitioners of environmental economics, confirm the adequacy and robustness of methods used to conduct economic analyses, and apply those methods to solve relevant and important problems.

**Outcomes.** The term “outcomes” refer to the result, effect, or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related or programmatic in nature, must be quantitative, and may not necessarily be achievable during the project period

**Outputs.** The term “outputs” refer to an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work products related to an environmental goal or objective, that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during the project period, and can include providing policy relevant information regarding improved research tools, and policy relevant research findings to workshop participants and to the interested public through workshop proceedings.

Through the awards under this RFP, EPA expects the following outcomes for Area 1 : (a) improve research and presentation skills of non-federal environmental economists (b) improve the capabilities of non-federal environmental economists and survey researchers to measure quantitative benefits to human health, the environment, and communities; (c) improved quality and quantity of research on scientific and economic issues affecting human health and the environment; and (d) innovation in addressing high-priority environmental problems making full use of economic information.

EPA expects the following outcomes for awards for Area 2: (a) support partnerships between environmental economists, EPA, other federal, state, and local agencies, survey researchers, and other interested parties, (b) encourage more empirical studies on environmental economics and an increased capacity of non-federal environmental economists to evaluate the economic benefits, costs, and impacts of environmental programs generally, and (c) provide additional information on opportunity costs, the measurement of benefits, costs and impacts, and advancing knowledge on a wider array of environmental economic principles and tools

The expected outputs of the proposed projects for Area 1 include providing policy relevant information regarding improved research tools and policy relevant research findings to workshop participants and to the interested public through workshop proceedings. Outputs for Area 2 include research results increasing scientific knowledge about the use of environmental economics for environmental policy. These results (for both areas) should appear as reports, presentations, Ph.D. dissertations, and peer-reviewed journal publications.

### **C. Authority and Regulations**

Projects supported by this RFP could include addressing environmental quality concerns in the following statutes, and the provisions that provide for the support of assistance agreements:

*Clean Air Act, as amended, Section 103, 42 U.S.C. 7403*

*Clean Water Act, as amended, Section 104, 33 U.S.C. 1254*

*Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, Section 1442, 42 U.S.C. 300 j-1*

*Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, Section 8001, 42 U.S.C. 6981*

*Toxic Substances Control Act, Section 10, 15 U.S.C. 2609*

*Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, Section 20, 7 U.S.C. 136r*

Applicable regulations include: 40 CFR Part 30 (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations), 40 CFR Part 31 (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments) and 40 CFR Part 40 (Research and Demonstration Grants). Applicable OMB Circulars include: OMB Circular A-21 (Cost Principles for Educational Institutions) relocated to 2 CFR Part 220, OMB Circular A-87 (Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments) relocated to 2 CFR Part 225, OMB Circular A-102 (Grants and Cooperative Agreements With State and Local Governments), OMB Circular A-110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Other Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Non-Profit Organizations) relocated to 2 CFR Part 215, and OMB Circular A-122, (Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations) relocated to 2 CFR Part 230.

#### **D. Specific Areas of Interest/Objectives and Outcomes**

Applicants must submit proposals for one of the two subject areas of interest listed below. Proposals that do not address one of these areas will be rejected. Proposals that combine both areas will not be accepted. While proposals must address one area only, eligible applicants may submit more than one proposal for each area, or proposals for both areas, so long as each proposal is separately submitted and demonstrably different.

**Area 1. Environmental Economics Workshops** - NCEE is seeking proposals for workshops in three different categories. Proposals for Area 1 must address one and only one of the workshop categories described below. While applicants may submit proposals for more than one workshop category, each one must be separately submitted

##### **(a) Dissertation Workshops Category**

Purpose – The purpose of these workshops is to improve the quality of current and future research in environmental and resource economics and related research topics by providing a forum for early and significant input for students pursuing, or having recently completed, a Ph.D. in environmental and resource economics. The goal of these workshops is to promote the field of environmental and resource economics by fostering a collegial atmosphere for mentoring students and giving constructive feedback on research ideas and projects, thus enticing top quality graduate students to the field to do cutting edge research. The workshop should focus on research in its early stages with no formal papers expected. It is intended that university faculty member(s) and others with significant research experience will participate in providing constructive advice to current or potential graduate students on their research agenda. Topics are not restricted, other than to the broad field of environmental and resource economics.

Intended participants – These workshops are intended to provide support and significant early guidance to graduate students who are currently pursuing,

considering pursuing, or having recently completed a Ph.D. in environmental and resource economics. Potential student participants are expected to be at the Master's or Ph.D. level, although undergraduate students should not be precluded from participation. Mentor/discussants should be established researchers in the field of environmental and resource economics.

### **(b) Methods Development and Training Workshops Category**

Purpose – The purpose of these workshops is to provide guidance and training on a specific analytical activity of importance in environmental economics and closely related economic analysis. The choice of analytical topic or activity should be based on two criteria: 1) it should be public policy relevant and 2) there should be a lack of adequate attention given to the topic in texts, journals, and other existing venues that serve as educational sources for students and practitioners in the field. The goals of these workshops are the following: (1) to develop the theoretical basis for guidance of correct analytical approaches, (2) to identify best practices that have been used by respected practitioners, (3) to identify useful data sources, and (4) to describe and discuss potential problems typically faced by analysts and generally to educate an inexperienced audience about the activity. The outcome of the workshop should be that attendees learn to conduct analysis at a higher level of quality and with greater credibility.

As the purpose of the workshops is to improve analytical activity, topics should be important to the conduct of public policy analysis. For example, elements of cost benefit analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, regional economic impact analysis, simulation modeling, and mathematical programming and decision analyses represent some types of analytical activities used in policy analysis. Particular issues or problems arising when these or similar analyses are conducted in the context of environmental policy analysis would be appropriate topics for training workshops. In addition, topics could also represent an analytical problem that has not been fully resolved by prior work. This workshop should not focus on an issue that is in the early stage of development or for which appropriate theoretical bases do not exist. But it could focus on an issue that is still subject to some debate about best practices, best data or appropriate solutions.

Intended participants – Since this type of workshop is a teaching and training forum, it is expected that the organizer will be a well respected expert on the topic at hand with knowledge of others who are relevant experts, and that the persons who will present materials and lead discussions at the workshop will be recognized expert practitioners either in the academic community or highly credible non-academic institutions. We expect attendees would have undergraduate or graduate level training in economics but lack extensive experience in the particular analytical topic under discussion. The workshop should reach out to students as well as professional staff employed in the nonprofit sector, the private sector and the non-federal

government sector at the state, tribal or local level. Federal participation, if any, will be coordinated by EPA. The materials should be accessible to inexperienced or junior staff so long as they have the requisite training in economics. The topic could also draw interest from more senior professionals who wish to learn about a topic they have not yet studied in depth.

Workshop format – In order to maximize exposure, applicants may offer to conduct the workshop more than once, either in the same location in subsequent years or in a variety of locations. Such proposals should make clear the need for multiple deliveries of the same workshop.

### **(c) Current Issues Workshops Category**

Purpose – The purpose of this type of workshop is to explore in depth a timely topic through the use of environmental economics analyses and closely related economic analysis techniques and to disseminate findings to a wide audience. Such findings should be useful in solving relevant environmental problems or resolving issues of significant debate. The workshop should offer original, timely topics or approaches to addressing the issues, while avoiding overlap with other conferences. The topic, as well as the design of the workshop, should aim to stimulate lively interest and interaction, which might extend to a much larger audience than those able to attend.

Intended participants – Those attending should be interested in the application of the findings of the workshop and may include economists, other scientists and staff employed in the non-profit, private or non-federal government sector. Federal participation, if any, will be coordinated by EPA. Identifying effective and innovative ways to attract the right participants and/or to disseminate workshop proceedings increases the workshop's usefulness. The intended audience may reach beyond those attending, as workshop findings should be made available in a variety of ways, such as proceedings.

Workshop format – Designing the workshop format to encourage lively and effective interaction among presenters and participants increases its usefulness. Workshop proposals may choose either to identify a *specific topic*, or they may identify a *process* for selecting the topic and emphasize their expertise in meeting all of the criteria. In the former case, the proposal will be judged by how effectively the topic and the workshop design would achieve the purposes described above. In the latter case, the proposal will be judged based on the likelihood that the process will result in a topic and workshop design that achieves the purposes as described above.

### **(d) Other Considerations Applying to All Three Workshop Categories**

(i) Applicants may offer to develop an Internet based "virtual workshop" either as an adjunct to or a substitute for a traditional physical workshop. For example, an

Internet based adjunct could be developed by first conducting a traditional workshop and then establishing a web site which contains the basic materials presented in the original workshop together with a summary or transcript of the conversation that occurred in the original workshop. Alternatively, a completely virtual workshop could be offered in which a web site is developed containing the basic materials and then participants "attend" the workshop over a specified period of time to read the materials and interact with each other through a moderator by means of the Internet. Although we encourage applicants to be imaginative in devising new workshop formats, these will not necessarily be preferred to traditional workshops that require the physical presence of participants.

(ii) Funding received through this program may be used for a variety of types of expenses including but not limited to: cost of renting workshop facilities, provision of working meals during regular business hours (breakfasts and lunches) and light refreshments during the workshop (not including alcohol or receptions); payments to organizers and presenters for their time, cost of travel and per diem expenses; purchase, development and distribution of presentation materials and financial assistance to participants to defray the cost of travel and per diem expenses. Funds may not be used to purchase equipment or facilities. In reviewing all proposals, the cost-effectiveness of the budget will be a factor in determining awards.

(iii) This solicitation is not intended to provide funds for presentations that occur during the regularly scheduled annual meetings or conferences of existing professional organizations. Special sessions that are scheduled outside but contiguous with the regular meetings may be considered. Applicants must demonstrate that their proposal is consistent with this intent.

**Area 2. Data Gathering for Dissertation and Early Career Research on the Pollution Control Aspects of Environmental Economics.** NCEE is also seeking proposals for gathering data for use in doctoral dissertations and other early career research in those areas of environmental economics involving pollution control. The data to be gathered should be relevant to protecting public health and the environment particularly for state, tribal and local pollution control agencies. That is, the research to be funded must be covered by one of the statutory authorities applicable to this RFP (see [Section I.C](#)). For example, data gathering related to the non-pollution control aspects of the management of pristine forests would not be eligible. Data may not be gathered primarily for the direct use of EPA or other federal government agencies; data must be gathered primarily for non-federal research purposes. Examples include data needed to model the behavior of pollution sources in response to policies, unintended consequences of policies, and the costs, benefits, and impacts of policies. Proposals in this area may be directed at short- or long-term priority research issues discussed in the Agency's [Environmental Economics Research Strategy](#) (see U.S. EPA 2005), although this is not a requirement.

The applicant's principal investigator or at least one major co-investigator for proposals under Area 2 must be either a currently-enrolled Ph.D. student or have received their Ph.D.

no earlier than January 1, 2006. The proposals should involve data primarily intended for use in a research project being prepared by this investigator. If this investigator is a Ph.D. student this data must be used for his or her dissertation research. This investigator may request minimal EPA funds for their time spent on the project. EPA encourages other researchers, such as Ph.D. advisors and committee members, senior faculty, and other colleagues to collaborate in the research proposal; however, no EPA funds may be allocated for time spent by these other researchers. The bulk of funds in the proposed budget should cover the gathering of data.

### **E. References**

U.S. EPA. 2005. Environmental Economics Research Strategy. EPA/600/R-04/195. <http://www.epa.gov/ord/htm/documents/econresearch.pdf> (PDF) (147pp, 4.92MB)

U.S. EPA. 2006. 2006-2011 EPA Strategic Plan, [http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/2006/entire\\_report.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/2006/entire_report.pdf) (PDF) (184 pp, 11.56 MB)

U.S. EPA 2009. 2009–2014 EPA Strategic Plan Change Document, September 30, 2008, [http://epa.gov/ocfo/plan/pdfs/strategic\\_plan\\_change\\_document\\_9-30-08.pdf](http://epa.gov/ocfo/plan/pdfs/strategic_plan_change_document_9-30-08.pdf) (65 pp, 904KB)

### **F. Special Requirements**

Groups of two or more eligible applicants may choose to form a consortium and submit a single proposal for this assistance agreement. The proposal must identify which organization will be the recipient of the assistance agreement and which organizations(s) will be sub-awardees of the recipient. For-profit organizations are not eligible applicants and may not be members of coalitions. See [Section IV.H](#) of the solicitation which addresses the evaluation of an applicant's proposed contractors and subawardees. These instruments must be in compliance with the competitive Procurement Standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR 31.36 as appropriate.

## **Section II. AWARD INFORMATION**

The total amount expected to be awarded under this RFP is approximately \$400,000. All of these funds may not be fully obligated by EPA at the time of awards, but may be paid out by EPA in installments over several years at \$100,000-\$150,000 per year, depending on the availability of EPA funds, satisfactory performance of applicants, other applicable considerations, and the cash flow requirements of awarded proposals. Total requests for EPA funding in proposals submitted for Area 1 must be for more than \$25,000 and less than \$150,000, and total requests for EPA funding in proposals submitted for Area 2 must be for more than \$30,000 and less than \$75,000 to be considered. EPA may award assistance agreements for project periods of up to 5 years where appropriate. Cost sharing is not required. If incrementally funded in FY2010, future funding is not guaranteed

EPA reserves the right to award fewer than 5 agreements or more than 7 agreements, or to make no awards, under this solicitation.

EPA may award both grants and cooperative agreements under this announcement. Under a *grant*, EPA employees are not permitted to be substantially involved in the planning and execution of the research.

Where appropriate, EPA may award *cooperative agreements* when substantial involvement between EPA employees and grant recipients is anticipated, such as facilitating federal participation at workshops. Assistance recipients that are awarded cooperative agreements rather than grants are required to work closely with the EPA Project Officer and other EPA personnel, as determined by EPA, during the performance of the project. These collaborations may include data and information exchange with EPA, EPA providing technical input to experimental design and theoretical development, Agency co-sponsorship of workshops, and joint authorship of journal articles on these activities. **To ensure that all proposals receive fair consideration, applicants may not identify EPA cooperators or interactions; specific interactions between EPA's investigators and those of the prospective recipient for cooperative agreements will be negotiated at the time of award.**

In appropriate circumstances, EPA reserves the right to partially fund proposals by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed projects. If EPA decides to partially fund a proposal, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice any applicants or affect the basis upon which the proposal, or portion thereof, was evaluated and selected for award, and therefore maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process.

Pre-award costs must comply with 40 C.F.R. 30.25(i) for universities and non-profits and 2 CFR Part 225, Appendix B, Item 31 for governmental organizations. Recipients may incur otherwise eligible and allowable pre-award costs up to 90 days prior to award at their own risk without prior approval of EPA's award official. If EPA determines that the requested pre-award costs comply with the relevant OMB Circular (A-87 for public entities and A-122 for nonprofit organizations), and that the costs are justified as allocable to the project, then these costs may be included as allowable expenditures at the time that the assistance award document is prepared. However, if for any reason, EPA does not fund the proposal or the amount of the award is less than the applicant anticipated, then EPA is under no obligation to reimburse the applicant for these costs. Thus, applicants incur pre-award costs at their own risk. Costs incurred more than 90 days prior to award require the approval of EPA's Award Official.

EPA reserves the right to make additional awards under this announcement, consistent with Agency policy and guidance, if additional funding becomes available after the original selections are made. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than 6 months after the original selection decisions.

### **Section III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION**

#### **A. Eligible Applicants**

Eligible applicants include States, territories, the District of Columbia, Indian Tribes, interstate organizations, intrastate organizations, and possessions of the U.S. Eligible applicants also include public and private universities and colleges, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private nonprofit institutions. For profit organizations are not eligible

Nonprofit organizations described in Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that engage in lobbying activities as defined in Section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 are not eligible to apply. For profit organizations are not eligible to receive EPA funding under this RFP.

National laboratories funded by Federal Agencies (Federally-Funded Research and Development Centers, “FFRDCs”) may not apply due to the restrictions of 40 CFR 30.2(cc). FFRDC employees may cooperate or collaborate with eligible applicants within the limits imposed by applicable legislation and regulations. They may participate in planning, conducting, and analyzing the research directed by the applicant, but may not direct projects on behalf of the applicant organization. The institution, organization, or governance receiving the award may contract with or provide subawards to FFRDC’s with funds through its grant from the EPA to an FFRDC for research personnel, supplies, equipment, and other expenses directly related to the research. ([See Section IV](#)).

Federal Agencies may not apply. Federal agencies with statutory authority to provide services on a reimbursable basis to non-federal entities may enter into financial transactions with successful applicants to the extent authorized by law. However, Federal employees are not eligible to serve in a principal leadership role on an assistance agreement, and may not otherwise receive salaries or augment their Agency’s appropriations in other ways (e.g., travel funds) through grants made by this program.

#### **B. Cost Sharing or Match**

There are no cost-sharing or matching funds requirements under this RFP although the cost effectiveness of the project will be evaluated under Section V. Allowable costs for nonprofit organizations are defined in OMB circular A-122; allowable costs for public entities are defined in OMB Circular A-87.

### **C. Other Threshold Eligibility Criteria**

All of the following threshold criteria must be met by the time of proposal submission in order for a proposal to receive funding consideration. Only those proposals that meet all of these criteria will be evaluated against the ranking criteria in [Section V](#) of this solicitation. Applicants deemed ineligible for funding consideration will be notified within 15 calendar days of the ineligibility determination.

1. The applicant must demonstrate that it is eligible to apply for financial assistance under this solicitation.
2. Proposals that fail to demonstrate a public purpose of support or stimulation will not be considered. For example, proposals that request funding for a research project which is primarily for the direct use or benefit of a Federal program or provides a direct service for a Federal agency are not eligible.
3. To be eligible for funding consideration, a proposal's focus must consist of activities within the statutory terms of EPA's financial assistance authorities; specifically, the statute(s) listed in [Section I.C.](#) above. Generally, a project must address the causes, effects, extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of air pollution, water pollution, solid/hazardous waste pollution, toxic substances control, or pesticide control depending on which statute(s) is listed in I.C. above.

These activities must relate to the gathering or transferring of information or advancing the state of knowledge. Proposals must emphasize this "learning" concept, as opposed to "fixing" an environmental problem via a well-established method. Proposals relating to other topics which are sometimes included within the term "environment" such as recreation, conservation, restoration, protection of wildlife habitats, etc., must describe the relationship of these topics to the statutorily required purpose of pollution prevention and/or control.

4. The applicant's proposal must focus on EPA mission-related issues connected to protecting human health and safeguarding the natural environment as specified in [Section I.B.](#) which addresses the relationship to EPA's Strategic Plan.
5. Proposals must address one of the Areas described in Sections I.B and D. While proposals must address one Area only, eligible applicants may submit more than one proposal for each Area, or proposals for both Areas, so long as each proposal is separately submitted and demonstrably different.
6. Proposals for Area 1 must address one of the three types of workshops described in Section I.D. While applicants proposing for this area may separately submit multiple proposals, each proposal must address just one of the three types of workshop categories.
7. Proposals for Area 1 as described in [Section I.D](#) must be for more than \$25,000 and less than \$150,000 of EPA funds in total to be considered; proposals for Area 2 must be for more than \$30,000 and less than \$75,000 of EPA funds in total to be considered.

8. This solicitation is not intended to provide funds for workshops in Area 1 that occur during the regularly scheduled annual meetings or conferences of existing professional organizations. Special sessions that are scheduled outside but contiguous with the regular meetings may be considered. Applicants must demonstrate that their proposal is consistent with this intent
9. For proposals under Area 2, the applicant's principal investigator or at least one major co-investigator, must be a currently-enrolled Ph.D. student or have received their Ph.D. no earlier than January 1, 2006. If this investigator is a Ph.D. student the funded data collection must be used for their dissertation research.
10. a. Proposals must substantially comply with the proposal submission instructions and requirements set forth in [Section IV](#) of this announcement or else they will be rejected. However, where a page limit is expressed in [Section IV](#) with respect to the proposal or parts of the proposal, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed.
- b. In addition, proposals must be received by the EPA or through [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) as specified in [Section IV](#) on or before the proposal submission deadline published in this announcement. Applicants are responsible for ensuring that their proposal reaches the designated person/office specified in [Section IV](#) of the announcement by the submission deadline.
- c. Proposals received after the submission deadline will be considered late and returned to the sender without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it was late due to EPA mishandling or because of technical problems associated with Grants.gov. Applicants should confirm receipt of their proposal with Shelley Levitt ([Levitt.shelley@epa.gov](mailto:Levitt.shelley@epa.gov)) as soon as possible after the submission deadline—failure to do so may result in your proposal not being reviewed.
11. Congress has prohibited EPA from using its FY 2010 appropriations to award grants to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or any of its subsidiaries and therefore in order to be eligible for funding consideration under this competition all applicants must affirmatively indicate that they are not subject to this prohibition. In addition, since this funding prohibition applies to subawards/subgrants and contracts awarded by grantees, applicants must consider it when preparing proposals.

## **Section IV. PROPOSAL AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION**

### **A. Internet Address to Request Proposal Package**

Electronic proposals submitted thru Grants.gov are encouraged and recommended. Applicants who do not submit through Grants.gov should download required forms at the following website: [http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/how\\_to\\_apply.htm](http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/how_to_apply.htm) .

An email will be sent to the Lead/Contact Principal Investigator and the Administrative Contact identified in the proposal package to acknowledge receipt by the EPA of the proposal and to transmit other important information during the Agency's review and notification process. *If you do not receive an email acknowledgment within 15 days of the submission closing date, immediately inform Shelley Levitt (levitt.shelley@epa.gov). Failure to do so may result in your proposal not being reviewed.*

## **B. Content and Form of Proposal Submission**

The proposal must contain all of the following materials. **It is essential that the proposal package contain all information requested and be submitted in the described formats, otherwise your proposal may be deemed ineligible.**

1. **Standard Form 424 – Application for Federal Assistance** – Applicants should fill in this form as appropriate and include it in their proposal.

Please note that the organizational Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Number System (DUNS) number must be included on the SF-424. Organizations may obtain a DUNS number at no cost by calling the toll-free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711.

2. **Key Contacts** - The applicant must complete a "Key Contacts" form and submit this in their proposal. The Key Contacts form should also include information on individuals that the applicant identifies as having major responsibilities (i.e., Principal Investigator) at the applying organization, as well as any other key individuals affiliated with other institutions entering into sub-agreements with the applicant. Please make certain that all contact information is accurate, including email addresses and phone numbers.

## **3. Budget/SF 424-A Form**

**(a) Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424A)** – Complete the SF-424A to indicate how you plan to expend the funds provided by EPA. There are no attachments. At a minimum, complete Section B- Budget Information and Section F- Other Budget Information. The total amount of EPA funding requested for the project period should be shown on line 5(e) and on line 6(k) of SF-424A. If indirect costs are included, the amount of indirect costs should be entered on line 6(j). The indirect cost rate (i.e., a percentage), the base (e.g., personnel costs and fringe benefits), and the amount should also be indicated on line 22.

Please note that institutional cost-sharing is not required. However, if voluntary cost-sharing is proposed, a brief statement concerning cost-sharing should be added to the

budget justification, and estimated dollar amounts must be included in the appropriate categories in the budget table.

**(b) Management Fees** - When formulating a budget, applicants must not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the direct costs and indirect costs at the rate approved by the applicant's cognizant audit agency, or at the rate provided for by the terms of the agreement negotiated with EPA. The term "management fees or similar charges" refers to expenses added to the direct costs in order to accumulate and reserve funds for ongoing business expenses, unforeseen liabilities, or for other similar costs that are not allowable under EPA assistance agreements. Management fees or similar charges may not be used to improve or expand the project funded under this agreement, except to the extent authorized as a direct cost of carrying out the scope of work.

#### **4. Narrative Proposal**

The Narrative Proposal contains an abstract, the project description and evaluation criteria discussion, budget justification, and data plan (if applicable). It also includes any attachments as identified below. Page limits for each element of the Narrative Proposal are specified below and must be adhered to. The Narrative Proposal must be provided on 8 ½ x 11" pages, single-line spaced, and should use no smaller than 12-point type. Reviewers will not consider any pages beyond the page limit for each element.

The contents of the Narrative Proposal include:

**(a) Abstract.** Provide a one page abstract of the project, including information describing the project, identifying the key contacts, summarizing the budget, and proposed project period (i.e., start and end dates). The abstract is a very important document in the review process. Therefore, it is critical that the abstract accurately describes the proposal and conveys all the essential elements of the research. Abstracts of proposals that receive funding will be posted on the NCEE web site. The abstract should include the information described below:

- i. Funding Opportunity Title and Number for this proposal.
- ii. Project Title: Use the exact title of your project as it appears in the proposal. The title must be brief yet represent the major purpose of the project. Because the title will be used by those not familiar with the project, it is recommended that the abstract should strike a balance between highly technical words and phrases and more commonly understood terminology. Do not use general phrases such as "research on."
- iii. Investigators: For proposals with multiple investigators, identify a single Lead Principal Investigator (PI). List the Lead PI, then the name(s) of any co-PIs who will significantly contribute to the project. Provide a web site URL or an email contact address for additional information for the Lead PI and each of the co-PIs (if any).

- iv. Institution: In the same order as the list of investigators, list the name, city and state of each participating university or other applicant institution. The primary institution applying for assistance must be clearly identified.
- v. Project Period and Location: Show the proposed project beginning and ending dates and the geographical location(s) where the work will be conducted.
- vi. Project Cost: Show the total dollars requested from the EPA (include direct and indirect costs for all years).
- vii. Project Summary: Provide three subsections addressing: (1) the objectives of the project, (2) a description of the proposed project, and (3) the expected results of the project and how it addresses the needs identified in the solicitation.

**(b) Project Description.** Provide a concise description of the project and discussion of which subject Area and category identified in [Section I.D](#) that it addresses. There is a limit of 12 single spaced pages for proposals to Area 1 (the workshops categories described in [Section I.D.1](#)) and 7 single-spaced pages for proposals to Area 2 (the data gathering for research described in [Section I.D.2](#)), excluding any literature citations.

Also provide a discussion of how the proposal addresses each of the specific evaluation criteria applicable for the Area and/or workshop category that is being proposed for (see [Section V](#)). Among the criteria listed, the applicant's programmatic capability and past performance are common to both Areas.

**Programmatic Capability and Past Performance:** Submit a list of federally and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include Federal grants and cooperative agreements, but not Federal contracts) similar in size, scope and relevance to the proposed project that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than 5 agreements, and preferably EPA agreements) and describe (i) whether, and how, you were able to successfully complete and manage those agreements and (ii) your history of meeting the reporting requirements under those agreements including whether you adequately and timely reported on your progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes of those agreements (and if not, explain why not) and whether you submitted acceptable final technical reports under the agreements. In evaluating applicants under these factors in [Section V](#), EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current/prior grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these factors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.

In addition, provide information on your organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project, and your staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to

successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project

**(c) Budget Justification.** Provide a justification for the proposed budget (limit 2 single spaced pages,) that describes the basis for calculating the personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual support, and other costs identified in the itemized budget. Budget information should be supported at the level of detail described below:

- i. Personnel: List all staff positions by title. Give annual salary, percentage of time assigned to the project, and total cost for the budget period.
- ii. Fringe Benefits: Identify the percentage used and the basis for its computation.
- iii. Travel: Specify the estimated number of trips, locations, and other costs for each type of travel. Explain the need for any travel, paying particular attention to travel outside the United States. Include travel funds for annual progress reviews or similar activities (estimate for two days in Washington, D.C.).
- iv. Equipment: Identify all tangible, non-expendable personal property to be purchased that has an estimated cost of \$5,000 or more per unit and a useful life of more than one year. (Personal property items with a unit cost of less than \$5,000 are considered supplies.)
- v. Supplies: "Supplies" means tangible property other than "equipment." Identify categories of supplies to be procured (e.g., laboratory supplies or office supplies). Specifically identify computers to be purchased or upgraded.
- vi. Contractual: Specify the amount you anticipate expending for services/analyses or consultants and specify the purpose of the contracts and estimated cost. Any procurement of services from individual consultants or commercial firms (including space for workshops) must comply with the competitive procurement requirements of 40 C.F.R. Part 30 or 40 C.F.R. 31.36, as appropriate. Please see subsection H., below for more details
- vii. Other: List each item in sufficient detail for the EPA to determine the reasonableness of its cost relative to the research to be undertaken. Note that subawards, such as those with other universities for members of the research team, are included in this category. Subawards must have a separate itemized budget and budget justification, not to exceed one additional page each, included as part of the proposal. Subawards may not be used to acquire services from consultants or commercial firms. Please see subsection H., below for more details.
- viii. Indirect Costs: If indirect costs are included in the budget, identify the cognizant federal audit agency and the approved indirect rate. If your organization does not have a cognizant federal audit agency, please note that in the proposal and provide a brief explanation for how you calculated your indirect cost rate. EPA will negotiate an indirect rate if necessary.

If a subaward, such as a subgrant with an educational institution, is included in the proposal, provide a separate budget and budget justification for the subaward. Include the total amount for the subaward under "Other" in the master budget. Any project containing subawards or procurement contracts that constitute more than 40% of the total

direct cost of the proposal will be subject to special review. Additional justification for use of these must be provided in the Narrative Proposal, including discussing the need for the sub award/procurement contract to accomplish the objectives of the research project. Please see [Section IV.H](#) below if your organization intends to identify specific contractors, including consultants, and subawardees in your proposal.

**(d) Data Plan (if applicable).** Provide a Data Plan (2 single spaced page limit) to make available to the public all data generated from observations, analyses, or model development (primary data) collected under an agreement awarded as a result of this RFP. The plan should describe how the applicant plans to make all data resulting from an agreement under this RFP available in a format and with documentation/metadata such that they may be used by others in the scientific community. This includes both primary and secondary or existing data, i.e., from observations, analyses, or model development collected or used under the agreement. Applicants who plan to develop or enhance databases containing proprietary or restricted information must provide, within the two pages, a strategy to make the data widely available, while protecting privacy or property rights.

## **5. Resumes**

Please attach resumes of all principal staff that will have a major role in the project. There is no page limit to resumes, and they may be included as an appendix to the main proposal package. You may include resumes from staff of subawardees such as universities. Do not include resumes of consultants or other contractors unless you have selected them in compliance with the Procurement Standards of 40 C.F.R. Part 30 or 40 C.F.R. 31.36. Please see [Section IV. H.](#), below for more details.

## **6. Guidelines, Limitations, and Additional Requirements**

### **(a) Letters of Intent/Letters of Support**

*Letters of intent* to provide resources for the proposed research or to document intended interactions are limited to one brief paragraph committing the availability of a resource (e.g., use of a person's time or equipment) or intended interaction (e.g., sharing of data, as-needed consultation) that is described in the project description. Letters of intent are to be included as additions to the budget justification documents and, except as noted below, do not count against page limitations.

All letters that do not commit a resource vital to the success of the proposal are considered letters of support. Letters of support, and letters of intent that exceed one brief paragraph (excluding letterhead and salutations), are considered part of the project description and are included in the applicable page limits for each Area in the solicitation.

Note: Letters of intent or support must be part of the application; letters submitted

separately will not be accepted. Any transactions between the successful applicant and parties providing letters of support or intent financed with EPA grant funds are subject to the funding restrictions described in [Section IV.D](#). Applicants must not submit letters of intent or support from EPA staff.

#### **(b) Confidentiality.**

By submitting a proposal in response to this solicitation, the applicant grants the EPA permission to make limited disclosures of the proposal to technical reviewers both within and outside the Agency for the express purpose of assisting the Agency with evaluating the proposal. Information from a pending or unsuccessful proposal will be kept confidential to the fullest extent allowed under law; information from a successful proposal may be publicly disclosed to the extent permitted by law.

In accordance with 40 CFR 2.203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their proposal package as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidentiality claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark proposals or portions thereof that they claim as confidential. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 CFR 2.204(c)(2) prior to disclosure. However, competitive proposals are considered confidential and protected from disclosure prior to the completion of the competitive selection process

#### **C. Submission Dates and Times**

This solicitation closes at **11:59 pm., EST on Monday, April 26, 2010. Proposals received after the closing date and time will be returned to the sender without further consideration.** See [Section IV.E “Submission Instructions and Other Submission Requirements”](#) for further information.

It should be noted that this schedule may be changed without prior notification because of factors not anticipated at the time of announcement. In the case of a change in the solicitation closing date, a new date will be posted on the NCEE web site (<http://www.epa.gov/economics>) and a modification posted on [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov).

#### **D. Funding Restrictions**

The funding mechanism for all awards issued under this solicitation will consist of assistance agreements from the EPA. All award decisions are subject to the availability of funds.

In accordance with the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act, 31 U.S.C. 6301 et seq., the primary purpose of an assistance agreement is to accomplish a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by federal statute, rather than acquisition for the direct benefit or use of the Agency.

Agency policy prevents EPA staff from providing individual applicants with any information that may create an unfair competitive advantage. Consequently, EPA employees will not review, comment, advise, and/or provide technical assistance to applicants preparing proposals in response to this solicitation, nor will they endorse a proposal or discuss in any manner how the Agency will apply the published evaluation criteria for this competition. Applicants having questions about this solicitation should e-mail their questions to [NCEE@epa.gov](mailto:NCEE@epa.gov), using “Grant Solicitation Question” as the subject. Questions and answers will be posted on an NCEE website supporting the solicitation, <http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/eed.nsf/Webpages/GrantsFAQ.html>.

Collaborative proposals involving more than one institution must be submitted as a single administrative package from one of the institutions involved. Each proposed project must be able to be completed within the project period and with the initial award of funds. Applicants should request the entire amount of money needed to complete the project. Recipients should not anticipate additional funding beyond the initial award of funds for a specific project.

#### **E. Grants.gov Proposal Submission Instructions**

**Applicants are strongly encouraged to use Grants.gov as the method to submit their application(s) to this solicitation.**

**If you are unable to utilize the Grants.gov application submission process, contact Shelley Levitt ([levitt.shelley@epa.gov](mailto:levitt.shelley@epa.gov)) for alternative application submission instructions at least 10 working days before the submission deadline to assure timely receipt of alternate instructions. In your message provide the funding opportunity number and title of the program, specify that you are requesting alternate submission instructions, and provide a telephone number, fax number, and an email address, if available. Alternate instructions will be e-mailed whenever possible. The proposal deadlines and other requirements of this solicitation still apply to applicants that use alternative submission methods.**

**Please read this entire section before attempting an electronic submission through Grants.gov.**

Note: Grants.gov submission instructions are updated on an as-needed basis. Please provide your Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) with a copy of the following instructions to avoid submission delays that may occur from the use of outdated instructions.

The electronic submission of your proposal package must be made by an official representative of your institution who is registered with Grants.gov and is authorized to sign applications for Federal assistance. For more information, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on “Get Registered” on the left side of the page. *Note that the registration process may take a week or longer to complete.* If your organization is not currently registered with

Grants.gov, please encourage your office to designate an AOR and ask that individual to begin the registration process as soon as possible.

The appropriate electronic proposal package available through the <http://www.grants.gov> site must be used for electronic submissions. To begin the proposal process, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the “Apply for Grants” tab on the left side of the page. Then click on “Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package” to download the compatible Adobe viewer and obtain the proposal package. For more information on Adobe Reader please go to <http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp> or [http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/program\\_status.jsp](http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/program_status.jsp).

Once you have downloaded the viewer, you may retrieve the application package by entering the appropriate Funding Opportunity Number (**EPA-OPEI-NCEE-10-01**), or the appropriate CFDA number that applies to this announcement (CFDA 66.611). You may also be able to access the application package by clicking on the Application button at the top right of the synopsis page for this announcement on <http://www.grants.gov> (to find the synopsis page, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the “Find Grant Opportunities” button on the left side of the page and then go to Search Opportunities and use the Browse by Agency feature to find EPA opportunities).

Please register for announcement change notification emails.

The Grants.gov website provides customer support via (800) 518-GRANTS (this is a toll-free number) or through e-mail at <http://www.grants.gov/contactus/contactus.jsp>.

**Proposal Submission Deadline:** Your organization’s AOR must submit your complete proposal package, as described in Section IV. B of the announcement, electronically to EPA through Grants.gov (<http://www.grants.gov>) no later than **11:59pm EST on Monday, April 26, 2010**. Proof of timely submission is automatically recorded by Grants.gov.

An electronic time stamp is generated within the system when the proposal is successfully received by Grants.gov. The applicant will receive an acknowledgement of receipt and a tracking number from Grants.gov with the successful transmission of their proposal.

Applicants should print this receipt and save it as proof of timely submission. When EPA successfully retrieves the package from Grants.gov, Grants.gov will provide an electronic acknowledgment of receipt to the e-mail address of the AOR. Proof of timely submission shall be the date and time that Grants.gov receives your proposal package.

EPA *strongly* suggests that applicants submit their proposals during the operating hours of the Grants.gov Support Desk, so that if there are questions concerning transmission, operators will be available to walk you through the process. Submitting it during the Support Desk hours will also ensure that you have sufficient time for the proposal to complete its transmission prior to the proposal deadline.

Applicants using dial-up connections should be aware that transmission can take some time before Grants.gov receives it. Grants.gov will provide either an error or a successfully received transmission message. The Grants.gov Support desk reports that some applicants abort the transmission because they think that nothing is occurring during the transmission process.

Please be patient and give the system time to process the proposal. Uploading and transmitting many files particularly electronic forms with associated XML schemas will take some time to be processed.

Please submit *all* of the proposal materials described below and in Section IV.B of the announcement. To view the full funding announcement, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on “Find Grant Opportunities” on the left side of the page and then click on Search Opportunities/Browse by Agency and select Environmental Protection Agency), or alternatively search the database using the CFDA number that applies to this announcement (CFDA 66.611).

## **1. Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions**

**The following forms and documents are required to be submitted under this announcement:**

- (a) On the initial electronic Grant Application Package page, complete the “Application Filing Name” field by entering the Lead/Contact PI’s name, starting with the last name. Note: Applicants do not need to complete the “Competition ID” field.
- (b) Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424): Complete the form. There are no attachments
- (c) Standard Form SF 424A – Budget Information: Complete the form. There are no attachments.
- (d) EPA Key Contacts Form 5700-54: Complete the form. If additional pages are needed, attach these additional pages to the electronic application package by using the “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box. (See Application Preparation and Submission Instructions below for more details.)
- (e) Narrative Proposal-Project Narrative Attachment Form (click on “Add Mandatory Project Narrative”): Attach a single electronic file labeled “Narrative Proposal” that contains the applicable items described in [Section IV.B.4.](#) of this solicitation. The document should be readable in PDF or MS Word and consolidated into a single file.

- (f) Other Attachments form for Resumes and Letters of Intent: The applicant must include in this attachment resumes of all principal staff having a major role in the project. If applicable, the applicant must also include letters of intent to provide resources for the proposed research or to document intended interactions.

For documents (b)-(d), click on the appropriate form and then click “Open Form” below the box. The fields that must be completed will be highlighted in yellow. Optional fields and completed fields will be displayed in white. If you enter an invalid response or incomplete information in a field, you will receive an error message. When you have finished filling out each form, click “Save.” When you return to the electronic Grant Application Package page, click on the form you just completed, and then click on the box that says, “Move Form to Submission List.” This action will move the document over to the box that says, “Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission.”

For documents (e) and (f) you will need to attach electronic files. Prepare your Narrative Proposal - document (e) – containing the information described in [Section IV.B.4](#) of the announcement, and save this document to your computer. When you are ready to attach your Narrative Proposal to the application package, click on “Project Narrative Attachment Form,” and open the form. Click “Add Mandatory Project Narrative File,” and then attach your proposal (previously saved to your computer) using the browse window that appears. You may then click “View Mandatory Project Narrative File” to view it. Enter a brief descriptive title of your project in the space beside “Mandatory Project Narrative File Filename;” the filename should be no more than 40 characters long.

For any other attachments that you would like to submit to accompany your proposal (document f), you may click “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box and proceed as before. When you have finished attaching the necessary documents, click “Close Form.” When you return to the “Grant Application Package” page, select the “Other Attachments Form” and click “Move Form to Submission List.” The form should now appear in the box that says, “Optional Completed Documents for Submission.”

Please also refer to the instructions provided at the bottom of the screen in the Grants Application Package webpage, which provide more detailed information and guidance on the steps to take to submit attachments as part of your application.

Once the application package has been completed, the “Submit” button should be enabled. If the “Submit” button is not active, please call Grants.gov for assistance at 1-800-518-4726. Investigators should save the completed application package with two different file names before providing it to the AOR to avoid having to re-create the package should submission problems be experienced or a revised application needs to be submitted.

Submitting the proposal package. The proposal package must be transferred to Grants.gov by an AOR. The AOR should close all other software before attempting to submit the proposal package. Click the “submit” button of the proposal package. Your Internet browser

will launch and a sign-in page will appear. *Note: Minor problems are not uncommon with transfers to Grants.gov. It is essential to allow sufficient time to follow all trouble-shooting instructions, including contacting Grants.gov, before 11:59 pm Eastern Time on the solicitation closing date.*

A successful transfer will end with an on-screen acknowledgement. For documentation purposes, print or screen capture this acknowledgement. If a submission problem occurs, reboot the computer – turning the power off may be necessary – and re-attempt the submission. If submission problems continue, call Grants.gov for assistance (Telephone: 1-800-518-4726) or Shelley Levitt at 202-566-2253.

Note: Grants.gov issues a “case number” upon a request for assistance.

**F. Intergovernmental Review** – All applicants should be aware that formal requests for assistance might be subject to intergovernmental review under Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs. Applicants should contact their State's Single Point of Contact (SPOC's) for further information. A list of SPOC's can be accessed at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html>. This information should be addressed in Block 16 of the required form, SF 424.

**G. Pre-proposal/Proposal Assistance and Communications.** - In accordance with EPA's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1), EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft proposals, provide informal comments on draft proposals, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their proposals. However, consistent with the provisions in the announcement, EPA will respond to questions from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the proposal, and requests for clarification about the announcement.

## **H. Contracts and Subawards:**

### **1. Can funding be used for the applicant to make subawards, acquire contract services, or fund partnerships?**

EPA awards funds to one eligible applicant as the recipient even if other eligible applicants are named as partners or co-applicants or members of a coalition or consortium. The recipient is accountable to EPA for the proper expenditure of funds.

Funding may be used to provide subgrants or subawards of financial assistance, which includes using subawards or subgrants to fund partnerships, provided the recipient complies with applicable requirements for subawards or subgrants including those contained in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as appropriate. Applicants must compete contracts for services and products, including consultant contracts, and conduct cost and price analyses, to the extent required by the procurement provisions of the regulations at 40

CFR Parts 30 or 31, as appropriate. The regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Applicants are not required to identify subawardees/subgrantees and/or contractors (including consultants) in their proposal. However, if they do, the fact that an applicant selected for award has named a specific subawardee/subgrantee, contractor, or consultant in the proposal EPA selects for funding does not relieve the applicant of its obligations to comply with subaward/subgrant and/or competitive procurement requirements as appropriate. Please note that applicants may not award sole source contracts to consulting, engineering or other firms assisting applicants with the proposal solely based on the firm's role in preparing the proposal.

Successful applicants cannot use subgrants or subawards to avoid requirements in EPA grant regulations for competitive procurement by using these instruments to acquire commercial services or products from for-profit organizations to carry out its assistance agreement. The nature of the transaction between the recipient and the subawardee or subgrantee must be consistent with the standards for distinguishing between vendor transactions and subrecipient assistance under Subpart B Section 210 of [OMB Circular A-133](#), and the definitions of subaward at 40 CFR 30.2(ff) or subgrant at 40 CFR 31.3, as applicable. EPA will not be a party to these transactions. Applicants acquiring commercial goods or services must comply with the competitive procurement standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR Part 31.36 and cannot use a subaward/subgrant as the funding mechanism.

**2. How will an applicant's proposed subawardees/subgrantees and contractors be considered during the evaluation process described in [Section V](#) of the announcement?**

[Section V](#) of the announcement describes the evaluation criteria and evaluation process that will be used by EPA to make selections under this announcement. During this evaluation, except for those criteria that relate to the applicant's own qualifications, past performance, and reporting history, the review panel will consider, as appropriate and relevant, the qualifications, expertise, and experience of:

- (a) an applicant's named subawardees/subgrantees identified in the proposal if the applicant demonstrates in the proposal that if it receives an award that the subaward/subgrant will be properly awarded consistent with the applicable regulations in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31. For example, applicants must not use subawards/subgrants to obtain commercial services or products from for profit firms or individual consultants.

- (b) an applicant's named contractor(s), including consultants, identified in the proposal if the applicant demonstrates in its proposal that the contractor(s) was selected in compliance with the competitive Procurement Standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR 31.36 as appropriate. For example, an applicant must demonstrate that it selected the contractor(s) competitively or that a proper non-competitive sole-source award consistent with the regulations will be made to the contractor(s), that efforts were made to provide small and disadvantaged businesses with opportunities to compete, and that some form of cost or price analysis was conducted. EPA may not accept sole source justifications for contracts for services or products that are otherwise readily available in the commercial marketplace.

EPA will not consider the qualifications, experience, and expertise of named subawardees/subgrantees and/or named contractor(s) during the proposal evaluation process unless the applicant complies with these requirements.

## **Section V. PROPOSAL REVIEW INFORMATION**

After EPA reviews proposals for threshold eligibility purposes as described in [Section III](#), NCEE will conduct a merit evaluation of each eligible proposal. In this merit evaluation, proposals will be evaluated and ranked by reviewers using the specific and general evaluation criteria discussed below that pertain to the subject area of the proposal. Rankings and recommendations will then be provided to the EPA Approving Official who will then make a final determination on which assistance agreements to fund. Preliminarily selected applicants will be provided instructions regarding submittal of the final grant application for award.

### **A. Evaluation Criteria for Area 1: “Environmental Economics Workshops”**

- 1. Dissertation Workshops:** Proposals under this category will be evaluated by a panel of EPA staff against the following technical criteria. The importance of the criteria is indicated in percentage terms in parentheses after each criterion, and applicants are advised that their proposals should explicitly address each of the following to facilitate evaluation:

- (1) Expected Results, Benefits, Outputs, and Outcomes:** Under this criterion applicants will be evaluated based on the results expected to be achieved during the workshop (outputs) and the benefits of the results (outcomes) including those identified in Section I. This includes the public interest values and environmental benefits the proposed workshop will provide to the non-Federal scientific community and how the topics presented meet the needs of a broad range of stakeholders. Applicants will also be evaluated based on their plan for tracking their progress towards achieving the expected outputs/outcomes including those identified in Section I. **(10%)**

**(2) Programmatic Capability:** Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account their:

(i) past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements described in in [Section IV.B\(4\)\(b\)](#) of the announcement **(5%)**;

(ii) history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in in [Section IV.B\(4\)\(b\)](#) of the announcement including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not **(5%)**;

(iii) organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project **(5%)**; and

(iv) staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project **(5%)**.

*Note: In evaluating applicants under items i and ii of this criterion, the Agency will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these subfactors (items i and ii above-a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors. (Total = 20 %)*

**(3) Student Instruction:** Applicants will be judged on the likely success of the workshop in providing constructive feedback, training, and advice to top quality graduate students. EPA will consider the method in which students are selected for participation in the workshop, the format used to provide feedback to the students, and the expertise of the mentors selected to participate in the workshop. **(30%)**

**(4) Cost-effectiveness:** Applicants will be judged by the reasonableness of the projected costs of the workshop, and the reasonableness of the budget. **(10%)**

**(5) Credibility and Relevance:** Applicants will be evaluated based on the credibility of the research papers and presentations communicated to the research communities, and the applicant's ability to provide evidence demonstrating substantial interest in holding the workshop for potential attendees. This will be judged primarily on the

professional standing and demonstrated success of the organization in organizing and hosting workshops. **(30%)**

- 2. Methods Development and Training Workshops:** Proposals under this category will be evaluated by a panel of EPA staff against the following technical criteria. The importance of the criteria is indicated in percentage terms in parentheses after each criterion, and applicants are advised that their proposals should explicitly address each of the following to facilitate evaluation:

**(1) Expected Results, Benefits, Outputs, and Outcomes:** Under this criterion applicants will be evaluated based on the results expected to be achieved during the workshop (outputs) and the benefits of the results (outcomes) including those identified in Section I. This includes the public interest values and environmental benefits the proposed workshop will provide to the non-Federal scientific community and how the topics presented meet the needs of a broad range of stakeholders. Applicants will also be evaluated based on their plan for tracking their progress towards achieving the expected outputs/outcomes including those identified in Section I. **(10%)**

**(2) Programmatic Capability:** Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account their:

(i) past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements described in [Section IV.B\(4\)\(b\)](#) of the announcement **(5%)**;

(ii) history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in [Section IV.B\(4\)\(b\)](#) of the announcement including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not **(5%)**;

(iii) organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project **(5%)**; and

(iv) staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project **(5%)**.

*Note: In evaluating applicants under items i and ii of this criterion, the Agency will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors*

*(e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these subfactors (items i and ii above-a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors. (Total = 20%)*

- (3) Uniqueness of Topic:** Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent to which the information presented is likely to address key methodological issues of importance to the environmental economics research community. The applicant will be judged on the degree to which the topic selected represents a unique, complex or novel methodological issue for which more information or training will further understanding of public policy. **(35%)**
- (4) Cost-effectiveness:** Applicants will be judged by the reasonableness of the projected costs of the workshop and the reasonableness of the budget. **(10%)**
- (5) Design and Effectiveness:** Applicants will be judged on the likely success of the proposed workshop for furthering understanding of the topic. Applicants will be judged on the workshop format, quality of instructors, methods for selecting participants, and means of disseminating information **(25%)**.

**3. Current Issues Workshops:** Proposals under this category will be evaluated by a panel of EPA staff against the following technical criteria. The importance of the criteria is indicated in percentage terms in parentheses after each criterion, and applicants are advised that their proposals should explicitly address each of the following to facilitate evaluation:

- (1) Expected Results, Benefits, Outputs, and Outcomes:** Under this criterion applicants will be evaluated based on the results expected to be achieved during the workshop (outputs) and the benefits of the results (outcomes) including those identified in Section I. This includes the public interest values and environmental benefits the proposed workshop will provide to the non-Federal scientific community and how the topics presented meet the needs of a broad range of stakeholders. Applicants will also be evaluated based on their plan for tracking their progress towards achieving the expected outputs/outcomes including those identified in Section I. **(10%)**
- (2) Programmatic Capability:** Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account their:
  - (i) past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements described in [Section IV.B\(4\)\(b\)](#) of the announcement **(5%)**

(ii) history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in in [Section IV.B\(4\)\(b\)](#) of the announcement including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not **(5%)**;

(iii) organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project **(5%)**; and

(iv) staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project **(5%)**.

*Note: In evaluating applicants under items i and ii of this criterion, the Agency will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these subfactors (items i and ii above-a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors. (Total = 20%)*

**(3) Cost-effectiveness:** Applicants will be judged by the reasonableness of the projected costs of the workshop, and the reasonableness of the budget. **(10%)**

**(4) Credibility:** Applicants will be evaluated based on the credibility of the resulting research and policy papers and presentations communicated to the research and policy communities, and the applicant's ability to provide evidence demonstrating substantial interest in holding the workshop for potential attendees. This will be judged on the following elements:

**(i)** the professional record of the organizer(s) and proposed participants relevant to the proposed topic of the workshop as measured by journal publications, conference proceedings, and similar outputs. **(10%)**

**(ii)** demonstrated success of the organization in hosting workshops. **(10%)**

(iii) additional factors that would increase interest in the workshop such as the attendance of faculty with very high professional standing (as noted by, for example, named professorships, very high publication or citation counts, journal editorships, and association board members or fellows), desirable locations, and accessibility. (10%)

**(Total = 30 %).**

**(5) Relevance:** Applicants will be evaluated on the relevance and usefulness of the proposed research topic to solving important environmental problems and whether the workshop design, or format, assures lively interest and interaction. **(30 %)**

**B. Evaluation Criteria for Area 2: “Data Gathering for Dissertation and Early Career Research on the Pollution Control Aspects of Environmental Economics.”**

Each eligible proposal submitted for this Area will be evaluated as described in Section D below. The importance of each criterion is indicated in percentage terms in parentheses after each criterion. Applicants are advised that their proposals should explicitly address each of the following to facilitate evaluation:

**(1) Relevance:** Relevance and usefulness of the proposed research to solving important environmental problems. Applicants will be evaluated based on usefulness of new analytical models or empirical methods and their correspondence to the priorities outlined in the Environmental Economics Research Strategy (U.S. EPA 2005) as described in [Section I](#). **(25 %)**

**(2) Cost-effectiveness:** Cost-effectiveness of the proposed data gathered in terms of its likely contribution towards advancing knowledge of the pollution control aspects of environmental economics for the research community, the interested public, and for policy makers. This will be judged by the absence of similar and equally useful data already collected by others, the importance of the data proposed to be collected to advancing knowledge of the pollution control aspects of environmental economics, the data plan, and the projected cost of gathering the data. The proposals will be evaluated based on the extent that the budget is clearly stated, detailed, and appropriate to achieve the project’s objectives. **(20 %)**

**(3) Credibility:** Likely credibility of the proposed data to the environmental economics research community. This criterion will be evaluated on the basis of the following five data assessment factors:

**(i) Soundness** - The extent to which the scientific and technical procedures, measures, methods or models employed to generate the information are likely to be reasonable for, and consistent with, the intended proposal **(10 %)**.

**(ii) Clarity and Completeness** - The degree of clarity and completeness with which the data, assumptions, methods, quality assurance, sponsoring organizations, and analyses employed to generate the information are likely to be documented **(5%)**.

**(iii) Uncertainty and Variability** - The extent to which the variability and uncertainty (quantitative and qualitative) in the information or in the procedures, measures, methods or models are likely to be evaluated and characterized **(5%)**.

**(iv) Evaluation and Review** - The likely extent of independent verification, validation and peer review of the information or of the procedures, measures, methods or models, and effectiveness of the plan in measuring and tracking progress **(5%)**.

**(Total: 25%).**

**(4) Programmatic Capability:** Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account their:

(i) past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements described in [Section IV.B\(4\)\(b\)](#) of the announcement **(5%)**;

(ii) history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in [Section IV.B\(4\)\(b\)](#) of the announcement including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not **(5%)**;

(iii) organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project **(5%)**; and

(iv) staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project **(5%)**.

*Note: In evaluating applicants under items i and ii of this criterion, the Agency will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these*

*subfactors (items i and ii above-a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors. (Total = 20%)*

- (5) Expected Results, Benefits, Outputs, and Outcomes:** Under this criterion applicants will be evaluated based on the results expected to be achieved during the workshop (outputs) and the benefits of the results (outcomes) including those identified in Section I. This includes the public interest values and environmental benefits the proposed workshop will provide to the non-Federal scientific community and how the topics presented meet the needs of a broad range of stakeholders. Applicants will also be evaluated based on their plan for tracking their progress towards achieving the expected outputs/outcomes including those identified in Section I. **(10%)**

### **C. Other Evaluation Factors**

In addition to the criteria above for both Areas, if the outcome of the evaluations results in two or more proposals having equivalent scores, the EPA Approving Official (the NCEE Office Director) will also take into consideration the following additional evaluation considerations to assist in selecting proposals for funding (listed in priority order):

For Area 1: “Environmental Economic Workshops”

- (i) Geographic diversity of the recipients and workshop locations;
- (ii) Topic diversity;
- (iii) Balance between: national and local workshops, workshop scope (single and multi-year efforts, small and large workshops, single and multi-day activities), and immediate value and institution building; and
- (iv) Anticipated budget availability and agency priorities as reflected, for example, in NCEE’s budget

For Area 2: “Data Gathering for Dissertation and Early Career Research on the Pollution Control Aspects of Environmental Economics”

- (i) Topic diversity;
- (ii) Geographic diversity of the recipients and research locations;
- (iii) Anticipated budget availability and agency priorities as reflected, for example, in NCEE’s budget.

### **D. Selection Process**

The review of proposals for Areas 1 and 2 will be conducted in a manner that provides for separate rankings of proposals submitted to each Area.

For proposals submitted to the workshop categories (Area 1), these proposals will be evaluated by an appropriate EPA panel and a final average score will be developed for each

proposal. Separate ranked lists for each of the three different workshop categories will be produced that are based on the final average scores of the EPA panel. These lists will be provided to the EPA Approval Official who will make the final decisions for funding. The highest ranked applicants in each category in this Area will be selected for funding. If two or more proposals in a category have the equivalent rankings, the approval official will consider the other factors above in making selections.

For proposals submitted on dissertation/early career research (Area 2), all eligible proposals will first be screened by extramural reviewers to identify acceptable and unacceptable proposals. Extramural reviewers are accomplished in their respective disciplines and proficient in the technical subjects they are reviewing. The external reviewers will evaluate the acceptability of an application based on the following criteria listed in descending order of importance:

- (i) The originality and creativity of the proposed research and the appropriateness and adequacy of the proposed research methods.
- (ii) Practical and technically defensible approach that can be performed within the proposed time period.
- (iii) Research contributes to scientific knowledge in the topic area.
- (iv) The proposal is well prepared with supportive information that is self-explanatory or understandable.
- (v) Budget: Although budget information does not reflect on the application's scientific merit, the reviewers are asked to provide their view on the appropriateness and/or adequacy of the proposed budget and its implications for the potential success of the proposed research.

Note that an application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged acceptable, so an unacceptable rating on any individual criterion may not necessarily render the entire application unacceptable. The overall rating provided by extramural reviewers should reflect their assessment whether the project serves as a creative and practical approach having technical and scientific merit, and is expected to contribute to the body of research in the field of environmental economics.

Proposals receiving acceptable extramural reviews from all extramural reviewers will be the first group to be evaluated by an appropriate EPA review panel, using the criteria detailed above in [Section V\(B\)](#) for Area 2 (proposals receiving unacceptable reviews from both reviewers will not be reviewed any further). A final average score will be developed for each of these proposals. A ranked list based on the final average scores in this Area will be provided to the EPA Approval Official who will make the final decisions for funding. The highest ranked applicants in this Area will be selected for funding. If two or more proposals in this Area have the equivalent rankings, the Approval Official will consider the other factors above in making selections.

If after these steps, there remain any additional funds set aside for this solicitation, then proposals receiving mixed reviews (e.g., at least one acceptable rating from extramural reviewers), will be evaluated by the same EPA review panel. The EPA panel will use the criteria for Area 2, and the same process outlined above will be implemented regarding scoring and ranking of proposals for consideration by the EPA Approval Official.

Applicants selected for funding will be required to provide additional information listed below under “Award Notices.” The proposal will then be forwarded to EPA’s Grants and Interagency Agreement Management Division for award in accordance with the EPA’s procedures.

NCEE may ask applicants whose proposals are selected to modify their work plans or budgets before making final funding recommendations. Applicants will not be asked or permitted to make any material changes to their work plans/budgets that would affect the basis upon which the proposal (or portions of the proposal) was recommended or selected for funding. EPA expects to identify and notify final contending applicants regarding the need for complete proposals within three months of the closing of this solicitation. Final contending applicants will then have approximately one to two months to complete and submit a full assistance agreement application.

## **Section VI. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION**

### **A. Award Notices**

Applicants will be notified by e-mail about evaluation decisions and the prospect of a grant award based upon the outcome of the review and recommendation of the Approving Official. A summary statement by the review panel will be provided to each applicant upon request

Applicants recommended for funding will be required to submit additional certifications and an electronic version of the revised project abstract. They may also be asked to provide responses to comments or suggestions offered by the peer reviewers, a revised budget, and/or to resubmit their proposal. EPA Project Officers will contact Principal Investigators to obtain these materials.

The official notification of an award will be made by the Agency’s Grants and Interagency Agreement Management Division. Applicants are cautioned that only a grants officer is authorized to bind the Government to the expenditure of funds; a preliminary selection does not guarantee an award.

NCEE anticipates that proposals under this announcement will be reviewed and recommendations for awards completed by June 30, 2010.

Upon receipt and processing of the formal grant applications, EPA will announce recipients through the posting of information on NCEE's website, <http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/eed.nsf/Webpages/Grants.html>.

EPA expects to announce successful awards no later than November 15, 2010.

## **B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements**

Applicants must comply with standard EPA assistance agreement requirements. Funded activities must be allowable under EPA statutory authority (see [Section III, Eligibility Information](#)). Expectations and responsibilities of grantees *and* cooperative agreement holders are summarized in this section, although the terms grant and grantee are used.

1. **Meetings:** PIs under the research Area "Data Gathering for Dissertation and Early Career Research on the Pollution Control Aspects of Environmental Economics," will be expected to budget for, and participate in, All-Investigators Meetings (also known as progress reviews) or similar activities at least once during the project period with EPA and other grantees to report on research activities and discuss issues of mutual interest. The budget should include the costs for one investigator to travel to Washington, DC, for two days.
2. **Approval of Changes after Award:** Prior written approval is required from the EPA if there will be a significant change from the work described in the proposal. Examples of these changes are contained in 40 C.F.R. 30.25. Note: Prior written approval is also required from the EPA for incurring costs more than 90 calendar days prior to award.
3. **Annual Reviews:** During annual reviews, the designated EPA Project Officer will evaluate the progress of the grantee in completing tasks detailed in the workplan, ensure that the grantee is meeting all programmatic requirements, and spending federal funds on allowable activities under the cooperative agreement.
4. **Semi-annual Progress Reports:** In addition to the required semi-annual progress reports recipients must submit proceedings for any conferences held as well as comprehensive overall draft and final technical reports. The final report should provide a complete description of all research undertaken and all results achieved; and the proceedings should be submitted in a form suitable for posting on the NCEE Website. In the case of Area 2 a copy of the dissertation and if possible the data gathered must be submitted and will be accepted in lieu of a final report. The draft final report will be due 90 days prior to the end of the assistance agreement. After reviewing the Project Officer's comments, the grantee will prepare a final report, which will be due at the end of the assistance agreement.

5. **Publications:** Grantees are in addition encouraged to develop and submit technical papers based on their research to appropriate technical journals. As required by 40 C.F.R. 30.36 and 40 C.F.R. 31.34 grant recipient must provide copies of any peer reviewed journal article(s) resulting from the award during the project period. In addition, the recipient should notify the EPA Project Officer of any papers published after completion of the grant that were based on research supported by the grant.
6. **Acknowledgement of EPA Support:** EPA's full or partial support must be acknowledged in the proceedings document, journal articles, oral or poster presentations, news releases, interviews with reporters and other communications. Any documents developed under this agreement that are intended for distribution to the public or inclusion in a scientific, technical, or other journal shall include the following statement, or another as specified by EPA's project officer:

“This proceedings document [or article] was developed under Assistance Agreement No. (“assigned upon issuance by EPA’s Office of Grants and Debarment”) awarded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. It has not been formally reviewed by the EPA. The views expressed in this document are solely those of [name of recipient] and the EPA does not endorse any products or commercial services mentioned in this publication.”

### **C. Reporting**

The recipient of these financial awards will be subject to post award monitoring by a designated EPA Project Officer. A Project Officer will be designated at the time of award of the assistance agreements. To comply with standard EPA post award monitoring requirements, the recipient must submit semi-annual progress reports, and participate in an annual review of the project with the EPA Project Officer. Annual reviews may take place on or off-site. Semi-annual progress reports detail the project status, tasks completed during the reporting period, compliance with the workplan, anticipated goals and tasks for the upcoming period, expenditures, and remaining grant funds. Additional guidance and information on suitable formats for the semi-annual progress reports will be provided by the designated EPA Project Officer.

During annual reviews, the designated EPA Project Officer will evaluate the progress of the grantee in completing tasks detailed in the workplan, ensure that the grantee is meeting all programmatic requirements, and spending federal funds on allowable activities under the grant or cooperative agreement.

In addition to the required semi-annual progress reports recipients must submit proceedings for any conferences suitable for posting on the NCEE Website as well as copies of any technical reports. The final report should provide a complete description of all results achieved. The draft final report will be due 90 days prior to the end of the assistance agreement. After reviewing the Project Officer's comments, the grantee will prepare a final report, which will be due at the end of the assistance agreement.

### **D. Disputes**

Assistance agreement competition-related disputes will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures published in 70 FR (Federal Register) 3629, 3630 (January 26, 2005) which can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/resolution.htm>. Copies of these procedures may also be requested through the Agency contact listed in [Section VII](#).

### **E. Nonprofit Administrative Capability Clause**

Nonprofit applicants that are recommended for funding under this announcement are subject to pre-award administrative capability reviews consistent with Sections 8.b, 8.c, and 9.d of EPA Order 5700.8, 'EPA Policy on Assessing Capabilities of Non-Profit Applicants for Managing Assistance Awards' which can be found at [http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700\\_8.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700_8.pdf). In addition, non-profit applicants that qualify for funding may, depending on the size of the award, be required to fill out and submit to the Grants Management Office the Administrative Capability Form, with supporting documents, contained in Appendix A of EPA Order 5700.8.

### **F. Human Subjects**

A grant applicant must agree to meet all EPA requirements for studies using human subjects prior to implementing any work with these subjects. These requirements are given in 40 C.F.R. § 26. Studies involving intentional exposure of human subjects who are children or pregnant or nursing women are prohibited by Subpart B of 40 CFR Section 26. For observational studies involving children or pregnant women and fetuses please refer to Subparts C & D of 40 CFR Section 26. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services regulations at 45 CFR § 46.101(e) have long required "compliance with pertinent Federal laws or regulations which provide additional protection for human subjects." EPA's regulation 40 C.F.R. Part 26 is such a pertinent Federal regulation. Therefore, the applicant's Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval must state that the applicant's study meets the EPA's regulations at 40 CFR § 26. No work involving human subjects, including recruiting, may be initiated before the EPA has received a copy of the applicant's IRB approval of the project and the EPA has also provided approval. Where human subjects are involved in the research, the recipient must provide evidence of subsequent IRB reviews, including amendments or minor changes of protocol, as part of annual reports.

### **G. Public Access and Information Release**

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-110 has been revised to provide public access to research data through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) under some circumstances. Data that are (1) first produced in a project that is supported in whole or in part with Federal funds and (2) cited publicly and officially by a Federal agency in support of an action that has the force and effect of law (i.e., a regulation) may be accessed through

FOIA. If such data are requested by the public, the EPA must ask for it, and the grantee must submit it, in accordance with A-110 and EPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. 30.36.

In addition, the proposal must include a plan (see “Data Plan” in [Section IV.B\(3\)\(e\)](#)) to make available to the public all data generated from observations, analyses, or model development (primary data) and any secondary (or existing) data used under a grant awarded from this RFP. The data must be available in a format and with documentation such that they may be used by others in the scientific community.

## **Section VII. AGENCY CONTACTS**

Applicants with questions about this solicitation should e-mail their questions to [NCEE@epa.gov](mailto:NCEE@epa.gov), using “Grant Solicitation Question” as the subject. Most questions from applicants, other than questions about an applicant’s meeting eligibility criteria described in [Section III\(A\)](#), will not be replied to directly. Instead, we will respond to all appropriate questions by posting answers on our website on the frequently asked questions (FAQ) page, <http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/eed.nsf/Webpages/GrantsFAQ.html>. We will acknowledge receipt of e-mail questions within two business days, indicating whether a response will be posted on our FAQ page. Questions submitted in other ways will result in a request to resubmit them by e-mail.

### **Agency Contact:**

Shelley Levitt

Phone Number: (202) 566-2253

E-mail: [levitt.shelley@epa.gov](mailto:levitt.shelley@epa.gov)

Questions should be submitted as early as possible. Only questions posed to us by five business days (Monday, April 19, 2010) before the closing date (Monday, April 26, 2010) will be considered, and no further changes will be made to the FAQ page three business days (Wednesday, April 21, 2010) prior to the closing date of the solicitation.

An email will be sent by NCEE to the Principal Investigator and the Administrative Contact to acknowledge receipt of the proposal and transmit other important information. If you do not receive an email acknowledgment within 10 business days of the submission closing date, immediately contact the Technical Contact listed under “Agency Contacts” in this solicitation. See “Submission Instructions for Electronic Proposals” for additional information regarding acknowledgment of receipt of electronically submitted proposals.

## **Section VIII. OTHER INFORMATION**

A brief overview of assistance agreements NCEE has awarded over the last few years is available at: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/eed.nsf/Webpages/Grants.html>